

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-19 were rejected. Claims 1-19 remain at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yatake et al. (EP 0978547 A1). Claims 5-7 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yatake et al. Claims 10-12, 14-17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yatake et al.

For all of these 102(b) rejections, the Examiner suggested in regard to the following limitations:

“an ethylene oxide adduct of a dihydric alcohol, containing a hydrocarbon group with 9 or less carbon atoms and having a ratio I/V of an inorganic value (IO) to an organic value (OV) not less than 1 and not larger than 1.37.”

and

“wherein said ethylene oxide adduct of a dihydric alcohol at least includes a branched hydrocarbon group.”

found in Claim 1 and 2, Claims 5 and 6, Claims 10 and 11, and Claims 15 and 16 that Applicants see Paragraphs [0013] – [0034] and [0083] – [0116] of the Yatake et al. reference, but failed to point out exactly how or where the claimed limitation directed to a ratio I/V of an inorganic value (IO) to an organic value (OV) is disclosed or suggested in the Yatake reference and failed to point out how the Yatake reference suggests the formation of the claimed structure and/or undertaking of the claimed process. These rejections are insufficient and improper.

Moreover, Applicants have searched the cited references but were not able to find the claimed limitation directed of the ratio I/V of an inorganic value (IO) to an organic value (OV) in the Yatake reference. As such, Applicants are unable to address these rejections without proper identification of these points by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide the requested details of the alleged basis of these rejections

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 4, 8, 13 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yatake* in view of *Yatake* (US 2005/0075421).

See Applicants remarks above.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Jan 18, 2007

By: David R. Metzger

David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000